

REMARKS

New claim 4 has been added by amendment. Support for this claim can be found on page 3, lines 16-21 of the specification as filed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,502,303 to Wasmann. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Wasmann does not teach "that said shell (3) *is integrally provided in one piece with* at least a foldable member (5)," as required. Wasmann teaches that a balance ring (40) comprises a body member (42) and a cap (43). In contrast to claim 1, Wasmann teaches that "[t]he balance ring 40 is manufactured by molding the body 42 and cap 43 *as separate pieces*," (see column 5, lines 66-67, emphasis added). Since the two pieces are separately molded, Wasmann clearly does not teach a shell that is *integrally provided in one piece with* a foldable member, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by Wasmann, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by the prior art and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasmann. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, from which claims 2 and 3 depend, Wasmann does not teach every limitation of the claim, namely that the shell and a foldable member are integrally provided in one piece. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find any suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Wasmann to provide the shell and a foldable member integrally in one piece, as required. Thus, since every limitation of claims 2 and 3 has not been taught, suggested or otherwise rendered obvious by the prior art of record, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made sufficient to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/579,300
Amdt. dated August 7, 2009
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2009

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. AEG-40434.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 7, 2009